DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 861 EA 025 238

AUTHOR English, Fenwick W.
TITLE A Typology of Metanarratives in Educational Leadership.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; *Educational Administration; *Educational Philosophy; *Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; *Foundations of Education; *Organizational Theories; Social Theories
IDENTIFIERS *Poststructuralism

ABSTRACT

This paper examines a typology of metanarratives in educational administration. "Metanarratives" represent "a global, overarching, encompassing set of rules that tell us...the necessary and sufficient conditions for the constructs we use and how to use them." From this perspective, logical positivism is considered one of the many metanarratives used in educational administration. Other metanarratives are also presented and are representationally classified with archetypical works illustrative of a common set of constructs and measurements. The typology seeks to create a basis for constructing a curriculum for the doctorate in educational administration at the University of Kentucky. Educational administration's traditional view, based on the two dominant metanarratives of behaviorism and structuralism, is argued to be inadequate because it produced few reliable, predictive studies; it refused to recognize the importance of "nonlabels"; and it has become increasingly isolated from the emerging mainstream movements that at one time supported its two dominant theoretical metanarratives. Two diagrams are included. (Contains 57 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 361 861

American Education Research Association
Division A-Symposium 42.34
Combining Art and Science to Confront Synechism in Educational Administration
Atlanta, Georgia, April, 1993

A TYPOLOGY OF METANARRATIVES IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Fenwick W. English
Professor
Educational Administration and Supervision
College of Education
University of Kentucky

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F.W. English

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 025 238

American Education Research Association
Division A-Symposium 42.34
Combining Art and Science to Confront Synechism in Educational Administration
Atlanta, Georgia, April, 1993

A TYPOLOGY OF METANARRATIVES IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Fenwick W. English
Professor
Educational Administration and Supervision
College of Education
University of Kentucky

Most theorists understand that how one approaches the development of theory is pre-shaped by the types of assumptions and grounding within which any theory is subsequently fashioned. Theory is therefore perspectival rather than neutral or even "objective," as that term has been traditionally used in research.

For a time the logical positivists believed that the basis for their research was "objective," i.e., unbiased. This is still the case for many steeped in this approach. However, their fundamental assertion that all things had to be verified by observation to be considered true did not apply to this fundamental assumption itself. The claim is therefore considered an article of faith rather than one grounded in empiricism (Feyerabend, 1991, pp. 70-71).

For nearly thirty years, educational administration has been dominated by behavioristic psychology and organizational sociology, foundational areas I have chosen to label, behaviorism and structuralism (English, 1992, pp.40-42), or what some others have called "the theory movement" and coincided with the founding of UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)in 1956(Campbell, Fleming, Newell and Bennion, 1987, p.14).

The "theory movement" was criticized by T.B. Greenfield (1988) as:

(1) largely unproductive in developing research results that explained much individual or organizational variance;
(2) failing in an effort to accurately predict organizational responses or link specific, isolated "behaviors" to controlled variables;
(3) de-humanizing in its impact by eliminating from its scope of study areas in the liberal arts curriculum that have historically contributed to an understanding of leadership such as biography;

Criticism has therefore been directed not only at the flaws in doctoral research of the theory movement, but more importantly to the foundational assumptions which have linked the broader disciplines to educational administration as an applied field.

EA025238

Lately, post-structuralists have examined and criticized various "scientific" disciplines as consisting of "grand" or "meta-narratives" where the latter represents, "a global, overarching, encompassing set of rules that tell us...the necessary and sufficient conditions for the constructs and measurements we use and how to use them"(Cherryholmes, 1988, p. 117). Metanarratives are supported by a set of often silent ethico-political decisions.

This brief paper attempts to examine a typology of metanarratives in educational administration. As such they reject the doctrine of logical positivism as the only "view" of the field. Instead,logical positivism is considered a metanarrative, one of many which have been and continued to be used in the field. Other metanarratives are also presented and representationally classified with archetypical works illustrative of a common set of constructs and measurements.

The Traditional Curriculum in Educational Administration

The traditional curriculum in educational administration has consisted of courses in applied areas which are considered fundamental to the practice of school management. These include law, finance, personnel and collective bargaining, school and community relations, board/superintendent relations, role centered curricula as in the case of separate courses for the principalship, supervisor, superintendent, along with curriculum development, research methods(largely quantitative), instructional supervision, introduction to the history and development of American education, and a field experience of some sort(practicum in a school setting).

This curriculum is buttressed by anchors in behavioristic psychology centered on skills and observable actions, and organizational sociology centered on theories of organizations, from Weberian bureaucracy(Gerth and Mills, 1970) through Mertonian sociology(1968) applied Lewinian psychology in the work of Argyris(1970), and Mintzberg's organizational structuralism(1979). More contemporary works are the concepts of organizational culture, an offshoot of organizational anthropology (Deal and Kennedy,1982), and "frame theory", a kind of eclectic organizational sociological menu (Bolman and Deal, 1991).

The two dominant metanarratives(privileged positions, see Cherryholmes, 1988) remain **behaviorism** and **structuralism**, which are mutually reinforcing of one another, producing hybrids such as the concept of climate(Halpin,1966) culture(Deal and Kennedy, 1991) and now Peter Senge's "learning organization"(1990) which has its roots in Argyris' earlier work on climate.

Challenges to the Dominant Metanarratives

The challenges to the dominant metanarratives in the field have come from these sources:

(1) a crisp intellectual attack on organizational sociology from the critical theorists(in the U.S. from Foster, (1986; Giroux, 1988; Aronowitz and Giroux, 1985; and lately Maxcy, 1991);
(2) a longer and more sustained attack on behaviorism in the form of the critiques around logical positivism and attendant assumptions; (Cherryholmes, 1988; Evers and Lakomski,1991);
(3) a shift in methodology away from purely quantitative approaches to qualitative methods (Lincoln and Guba,1985);
(4) changes in approaches in political science studies of leaders that are ethnographic and biographical in nature, de-emphasizing reliance on "behavioristic" methods,(Barber,1985);
(5) the collapse of structuralism and its linguistic foundations by the de-constructionists in literary studies(Felperin, 1988) which undermined assumptions that categories and concepts anchored in language remain stable over time(see Rapaport, 1989);
(6) changes in philosophy, notably epistemology, and the work of Foucault(1972). Also Foucault's "power-knowledge" concept(Gordon, 1980) reinforces some of the work of the critical theorists;
(7) the recognized importance of "craft knowledge", unique to the field and its importance in graduate studies as a knowledge source and its neglect in graduate studies (Blumberg,1989);
(8) gender studies which demonstrate the continued presence of the "glass ceiling" for women in administrative positions with linkages to the dominant organizational culture (Shakeshaft, 1982);
(9) a move towards a broader concept of leadership instead of administration(Rost, 1991), with an emphasis on the moral, ethical nature of leadership (Sergiovanni,1992) and empowerment as the objective instead of control (Maxcy, 1991; Giroux, 1992);
(10) various reform legislation and related research which portrays the inadequacies of current administrative structures and educational leaders to truly carry out basic reform (Elmore,1990; Sarason,1990).

I would not proffer that the literature suggests some sort of grand design at work to alter educational administration. Rather, a kind of sedimentary, layered and overlapping combination of movements and thoughts are congealing to move this applied discipline away from its traditional perspectives to newer loci. Where the field comes to rest is conjectural. There does appear to be an

emerging consensus that the two older metanarratives were inadequate, although that view is not reflected in the dominant textbooks regnant in graduate studies(with a few exceptions such as Foster, 1986; Rost, 1991; Maxcy, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1992 and English, 1992).

A Summary of the Inadequacies of the Field's Traditional View

In summary, then, the inadequacies of educational administration as it has been traditionally conceived and taught at the graduate level were that:

(1) it produced few, if any, studies that accounted for important variables that would lead to reliable prediction;
(2) it refused to recognize the importance of "non-behaviors" such as beliefs, value systems, perceptions, motivation, feelings, context and culture, linguistic patterns and their influence on thought and perception to produce meaning, gender orientation and difference and their parallel manifestations in the dominant definition of studies that reinforced the exclusion of women and minorities in administrative positions. What behavioral studies didn't explain was what should have been studied, i.e., that part of the variance that was excluded in the metanarrative as "scientific." It is the so called "non-scientific" content that is crucial to understanding leadership.
(3) its course structure reflected a disparate and unconnected clustering of skills and competencies, without any grand design or undergirding epistemology that could be responsive to the changes in other foundational areas except behavioristic psychology or sociological functionalism. In short, educational administration had become isolated from the emerging mainstream movements in the disciplines which at one time supported its two dominant theoretical metanarratives.

A Re-Emergence of Older Traditions in Modern Guises

There appears to be some acceptance of the view that "leadership" and "management" may overlap, but are essentially different in nature(Gardner, 1990). Management is dependent upon the existence of organizations, in contemporary society bureaucracies specifically. Leadership may exist within organizations, but is not essential in definitional terms. Bureaucrats may not be leaders. Leadership is a more generic concept.

However, "school leadership," by definition, includes an organization as part of the equation. This "box" presents a problem in defining a curriculum in educational

administration. To understand "school" as an organizational form, some knowledge of organizational theory is required. But that theory will have little to do with leadership. Theory is perhaps the boundaries that leaders work within, or in the case of structural reform, dare to challenge and change.

Curriculum in educational administration must prepare a future "leader" to grasp the conceptual boundaries of not only definitions of schooling that require control rather than empowerment or emancipation, but to envision alternatives that are both structural, instructional and moral in nature.

Behaviorism as a dominant metanarrative has led to the impoverishment of the discipline's capability to engage in a discourse that centers on leadership rather than management. Over time we have become less able to provide original, creative, visionary leaders because our curriculum eliminated the appropriate content as subjective and therefore "unscientific." The curriculum was "centered" on skills which were taught and tested as "de-contextualized," i.e, "good things" isolated from the uses to which they may be put. One result was that we have graduated sophisticated planners who confused refinement with reform, and worked diligently to extend systems which were even more control oriented than their predecessors. Skill centered courses which ask no questions about ultimate outcomes are epistemologically blind or naively scientifically "neutral," and are amoral as "free standing" curricula in our field.

Courses that lack hard questioning about the foundations that support them end up reinforcing the status quo by default. The status quo is hardly neutral in education. It is patently unfair and devastatingly prejudiced against non-mainstream, "at-risk" children (Kozol,1991).

The intellectual movement today in educational administration is about re-centering the discipline. That re-centering must acknowledge:

(1) older traditions in the humanities(history, literature, philosophy, mythology, biography, theatre) that have always been concerned with moral choices in a human world, and rather consistently asked questions about means and ends proprieties. These traditions must be re-conceptualized and re-introduced into educational administration curricula.
(2) the non-neutrality (objectivity) of acquiring administrative "skills" in de-contextualized classroom settings. Even our "in-box" activities are too antiseptic.The acquisition and application of skills is never neutral. Skills (or practice) are embedded in somebody's theory, even if we are ignorant of them.

The words of Keegan (1987) are instructive:
" Clauswitz, like Marx, is commonly portrayed as free-floating in time, simply a mind more powerful than any which had applied itself to its chosen subject before. Rarely is either subjected to the rigour of contextual-ization. Yet context, when theories as powerful as theirs are at stake, is all."(p. 3).

(3) a contextuality includes not only the exterior view of action, but the interior of contemplation, motivation, perception, emotion, conviction and hence morality (defined here as the necessity of action based on one's own reflection).

(4) the movement in post-structuralism, especially linguistic studies (de-construction) that illustrate that meaning is infinitely deferred, so there is no ultimate meaning possible(which doesn't imply that any meaning is acceptable or that meaning doesn't matter) (see Rapaport,1989). Moral choices must be made even if there is no final arbiter or criteria for such finality, especially in public policy settings in a pluralistic society in which special interest groups vie for a shifting hegemony.

(5) the poverty of the traditions of behaviorism and logical positivism as acceptable metanarratives in which to anchor its curricula and traditions of scholarship to describe, explain or predict anything large or meaningful about leadership.

(6) the conceptual, epistemological and political limitations of organizational theory to serve as an adequate, moral fulcrum from which to prepare educational leaders more concerned about emancipatory outcomes than control within the existing political-economic system.

(7) an increasing reliance upon qualitative studies as the means to more fully explore the dimensions of leadership, not only ethnography but biography and historiography as well. These approaches can deal with the moral dimensions and value decisions which are either not recognized or de-emphasized in purely quantitative approaches.

A Typology of Metanarratives in Educational Leadership

A tentative typology of metanarratives has been constructed to link the field of educational administration to the longer traditions in the humanities (English, 1993a).The typology "turns" on some critical changes which have occurred in educational administration, notably a shift in the words used to describe persons occupying such roles. It was not until the beginning of the Twentieth Century that the word "leader" is found in the literature pertaining to school administration (Cubberley, 1914).

The purpose of the typology is to create a basis for constructing a curriculum in the core courses for the doctorate in educational administration at the University of Kentucky. The typology is not envisioned as a linear chronology or continuum. Rather it is seen as a broken, sedimentary, partially chronological basis for topical delineation.

The typology employs several of Foucault's principles, namely reversal by rejecting logical positivism and behaviorism-structuralism as dominant metanarratives, or the use of this perspective to identify alternatives (see Griffiths, 1993). He also used the principle of discontinuity or ruptures, and implicitly rejected an underlying premise of historical continuity as a necessary foregrounding. The typology is anti-foundational and therefore denies that it is representational of the concept of "progress" in the discipline. It simply shows types of premises categorized as metanarratives.

What Foucault was able to do with the principles of reversal and discontinuity was to find new and different patterns (i.e., positivities) when he abandoned the notion of progress (historical continuity). He was therefore able to show how ideas jumped across disciplines and time periods(see Shumway, 1992).

Diagram #1

A Typology of Metanarratives in Educational Leadership (note: from Chapter 4 in Discourse and Theory in Educational Administration, F. English, New York: Harper Collins-in review with anticipated publication date of Fall, 1993a)

Topological Designation of Metanarrative Group	Archetypical Works/Authors
I.Pre-Scientific Views	mythology, legend Hero With a Thousand Faces (J. Campbell) Women Who Run With the Wolves (C. Estes)
II.Proto Scientific Views	The Iliad, Odyssey (Homer) Anabasis(Xenophon) History of the Peloponnesian War (Thucydides) The Republic(Plato) Parallel Lives(Plutarch) The Prince and The Discourses (Machiavelli) The plays of Shakespeare (Julius Caesar, Othello, Hamlet, Coriolanus, King Lear, Pericles

Diagram # 1(continued)

III.Pseudo Scientific Views	trait theory scientific management (F. Taylor) total quality management(Deming)
IV.Emergent Scientific Views	concepts of organization(Fayol, Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo, Chester Barnard)
V.Behaviorism	Administrative Behavior(Simon) Theory in Ed. Adm.(Halpin) Human Side of Enterprise(McGregor Theory of Leadership (Fiedler)
VI.Transitional Views (Behaviorism/structuralism) (metanarrative hybrids)	Social Psychology of Orgs(Katz and Kahn) Durkeim and Parsons' works New Patterns of Management (Likert) General Systems Theory(von Bertalanffy) Leadership & Ambiguity(Cohen and March)
VII.Broad Field Views (humanities scholarship) cross disciplinary)	Leadership(J.M. Burns) The Presidential Character(Barber The Mask of Command(Keegan) The Good High School(Lightfoot)
VIII.Structuralist Views	Formal Organizations(Blau & Scott Designing Complex Orgs(Galbraith) Structure in Fives(Mintzberg) Corporate Cultures(Deal/Kennedy) Reframing Orgs.(Bolman & Deal) Saussure and Contemporary Culture (Gadet)
IX.Critical Theory	Paradigms & Promises(Foster) Schooling & The Struggle for Public Life(Giroux) Educational Leadership(Maxcy) Educational Leadership(Hodgkinson Educational Leadership and The Crisis of Democratic Culture (Giroux)

Diagram #1(continued)

X.Post Modernism Post structuralism	The Archaeology of Knowledge (Foucault) Power/Knowledge(Gordon) Strategies of Deconstruction (Evans) Descent into Discourse(Palmer)

An example of finding a pattern by rejecting the idea of historical continuity or progress is shown in Diagram #2. Using Foucault's(1972, p.124) analytical concept of enunciative similarities, it is possible to see that scientific management and total quality management are nearly identical movements(English, 1993b p.4.) as opposed to seeing TQM as a progression of Taylorism and therefore somehow different and "better" as Deming and his advocates claim (see Gabor,1990, p.58). The principle of discontinuity is able to show that the two approaches' ethico-political contexts are nearly identical as the nature of hierarchical authority is reinforced, and the voices of the external expert legitimated. This occurs under the rubric of a quasi-religious quest to eliminate waste by reducing variance.

Diagram # 2
Enunciative Similarities Between Taylor's Scientific Management and Deming's Total Quality Management

Enunciative Element	Scientific Management	Total Quality Management
Authority	reinforces top management	same
Voices legitimated	role of external expert	same
Major metaphor	the assembly line	same
Primary data source	task analysis-stop watch	statistical control charts
Primary approach to problem solving	reduction of variance	same
Employee motivators	external-piece rate systems based on task analysis	employee involvement to engage in task "Pareto" analysis-called "empowerment"

Diagram # 2(continued)

Implicit goal	elimination of waste	same
Major Tactic/ Methodology	didactic-one right way	same

This preliminary analysis shows that the two approaches in the early and late twentieth century were cut from the same cloth. Where Deming's approach has succeeded is in understanding that without employee involvement, the reduction of variance causative by the human factor is considerably more difficult than if a model of external supervision were employed to attain this end. It also ought to be clear that the so-called "empowerment" of the employee in Deming's model is absolutely contained within a pyramidal structure that is reinforced with their "involvement." It is far from liberating. It might even be called a form of co-optation.

The question as to whether the concept of "metanarratives" is itself a privileged position and at least partially structural is an interesting one. While the post-structuralists would deny such was the case, Pavel (1992) posits an idea of Quine's that the use of language itself presupposes agreement on definitions and contains at least an implicit structure.

It seems that even the delineation of a tentative typology assumes that patterns can be ascertained clearly enough to be grouped in some fashion. An implicit structure must be assumed or evident for this to occur. This interesting question lies at the core of whether there really is a "post" structural view of the field.

References

Argyris, C.(1970) Intervention Theory and Method. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Aronowitz, S. and Giroux, H.A.(1985) Education Under Siege. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Barber, J.D.(1985) The Presidential Character. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Barnard, C.(1938) The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Blau,P.M. and Scott, W.R. (1962) Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Candler Publishing Company.

Blumberg, A.(1989) School Administration as a Craft. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolman,L.G. and Deal, T.E.(1991) Reframing Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Burns, J.M.(1978) Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Campbell, J.(1973) The Hero With a Thousand Faces. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
Campbell, R. F., Fleming, T., Newall, L.J. and Bennion, J.W. (1987) A History of Thought and Practice in Educational Administration. New York: Teachers College Press.
Cherryholmes, C.(1988) Power and Criticism. New York: Teachers College Press.
Cohen, M.D. and March, J.G.(1974) Leadership and Ambiguity. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
Cubberley, E.P.(1914) Rural Life and Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
Deal, T.E. and Kennedy, A.A.(1982) Corporate Cultures. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publising Company.
Elmore,R.F.(1990) Restructuring Schools. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
English, F.W.(1993a, in preparation) Discourse and Theory in Educational Administration. New York: Harper Collins.
English, F.W. (1993b) "A Post Structural View of the Grand Narratives in Educational Administration," in Organizational Theory Dialogue, AERA-SIG Newsjournal, Spring, 1993, pp. 1-4.
English, F.W.(1992) Educational Administration: The Human Science. New York: Harper Collins.
Estes, C.P.(1992)Women Who Run With the Wolves. New York: Ballantine Books.
Evers, C.W. and Lakomski, G.(1991) Knowing Educational Administration. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Evans, J.C.(1991) Strategies of Deconstruction. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Felperin,H.(1988)Beyond Deconstruction. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Feyerabend, P. (1991) Three Dialogues on Knowledge. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Fiedler, F.E.(1967) A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill.
Foster, W. (1986) Paradigms and Promises. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
Foucault, M. (1972) The Archaeology of Knowledge. New York: Pantheon Books.
Gabor, A. (1990) The Man Who Discovered Quality. New York: Penguin Books.
Gadet, F.(1989) Saussure and Contemporary Culture. G. Elliott(Trans.) London: Hutchinson Radius.
Galbraith, J.(1973) Designing Complex Organizations. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
Gardner, J.W.(1990) On Leadership. New York: The Free Press.
Gerth, H.H. and Mills, C.W.(1970) From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press.
Giroux, H.A.(1988) Schooling and The Struggle for Public Life. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Giroux, H.A.(1992) Educational Leadership and the Crisis of

Democratic Culture. University Park, PA: UCEA.
Gordon, C.(1980) Power/Knowledge. New York: Pantheon Books.
Greenfield, T.B.(1988) "The Decline and Fall of Science in Educational Administration," in D.E. Griffiths, R.T.Stout, and P.B. Forsyth(Eds.) Leaders for America's Schools(pp. 131-159). Berkeley, CA. McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
Griffiths, D.E. (1993, Winter) "Acceptance Speech," UCEA Review, 34:1, pp.3-5.
Halpin, A.(1966) Theory and Research in Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company.
Hodgkinson, C.(1991) Educational Leadership. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Katz, D. and Kahn, R.L.(1966) The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
Keegan, J.(1987) The Mask of Command. New York: Elisabeth Sifton Books.
Kozol, J.(1991) Savage Inequalities. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.
Lightfoot, S.L.(1983) The Good High School. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
Likert, R.(1961) New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G.(1985) Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications.
Maxcy, S.J.(1991) Educational Leadership. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
McGregor, D.(1960) The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
Merton,R.K.(1968) Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press.
Mintzberg, H.(1979) The Structuring of Organizations. Englewood, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
Palmer, B.D.(1990) Descent into Discourse. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
Pavel, T.(1992) The Feud of Language: A History of Structuralist Thought. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Rapaport, H. (1989) Heidegger & Derrida. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
Rost,J.C.(1991) Leadership for the Twenty-First Century. New York: Praeger.
Sarason, S.B.(1990)The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
Senge, P.(1990) The Fifth Discipline.New York: Doubleday.
Sergiovanni, T.J.(1992) Moral Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
Shakeshaft, C.(1982, March) " A Framework for Studying Schools as Work Settings for Women Leaders," Paper presented at AERA. New York.
Shumway, D.R.(1992) Michel Foucualt. Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia.
Simon, H.(1957) Models of Man, Social and Rational. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
Von Bertalanffy, L.(1968) General System Theory. New York: George Braziller.